DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 433 SP 020 716

AUTHOR Laman, Archie E.; Reeves, Dorothy E.
TITLE A Survey of Criteria for Admitting Students to Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE Jun 82
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability; *Academic Standards; *Admission Criteria; Comparative Analysis; Educational Trends; *Enrollment Trends; Grade Point Average; Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; Student Recruitment; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Qualifications; Testing

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of teacher admissions in institutions which are members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. A concomitant purpose was to determine, by comparison with a national study in 1972 on the same topic, emerging trends in teacher education. A questionnaire that was similar, in most respects, to the instrument used in the 1972 study invited responses, both structured and unstructured, from teacher training personnel in each institution. Replies from 121 institutions were studied. Information was sought about: (1) methods of admitting students to teacher education programs; (2) criteria used in admitting students to teacher education programs; (3) admission criteria for teacher education programs that students most often failed; (4) use of grade point averages in admitting students; (5) use of quotas in admitting students to teacher education programs; (6) initiatives being taken to change practices and policies of admitting students to teacher education programs; (7) number of students admitted to teacher education programs; and (8) recruitment efforts for highly qualified candidates for admission to teacher education programs. A summary of the significant findings pertaining to these topics is presented in both tabular and narrative form. An analysis is given of the data from each topic, and a commentary on the findings includes comparisons between the 1972 and 1981 studies. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220433

A SURVEY OF CRITERIA FOR ADMITTING STUDENTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

by

Dr. Archie E. Laman, Professor

Secondary Education

Dr. Dorothy E. Reeves, Associate Professor

Education Foundations

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Archie E. Laman

Dorothy E. Reeves

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WESTERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

June, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 020 716

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Delimitations of the Study	4
Survey of the Literature	4
METHOD	9
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	10
1. Method of admitting students to teacher education	11
2. Criteria used in admitting students to teacher education	12
3. Criteria for admission to teacher education most often failed	18
4. The use of the GPA in admitting students	22
5. The use of quotas in admitting students to teacher education programs	29
6. Number of students admitted to teacher education programs	30
7. Initiatives being taken to change the practices and policies of admitting students to teacher education	33
8. Recruitment efforts for quality candidates for admission to teacher education	35
Summary	38
DISCUSSION	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52
APPENDIX A: Cover Letter	54

		Page
APPENDIX B:	Questionnaire.	55
APPENDIX C:	Standardized Tests of Specific Basic Skills Reported to be Used as a Criterion for Admission to Teacher Education.	60
APPENDIX D:	Institutional Responses on Additional Criteria Used for Admission, Not Specified in Other Tables.	61

The cost of printing this publication by Western Kentucky University was paid from state funds KRS 57.375.

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1	Institutions Using Committees Whose Primary Function Is to Admit Students to Teacher Education, 1982 Compared to 1972.	11
2	Methods of Admitting Students to Teacher Education Other Than by Committee, 1982	12
3	A Comparison of Criteria Used to Admit Students to Teacher Education, 1982 and 1972. .	13
4	Institutions Reporting the Criteria for Admission to Teacher Education Most Often Failed by Students, 1982.	18
5	Number and Percentage of Institutions Reporting Whether Candidates for Admission to Teacher Education Are Allowed to Reapply for Admission, 1982 Compared to 1972.	20
6	Number of Final Denials for Admission to Teacher Education, 1980-1981.	22
7	The Number and Percentages of Institutions Using Various Overall GPAs as a Criterion for Admission to Teacher Education, 1982 Compared to 1972.	23
8	Major/Minor GPA Minimum Requirements for Secondary Teacher Education Students, 1982 Compared to 1972.	26
9	Major/Minor GPA Minimum Requirements for Elementary Teacher Education Students, 1982 . .	28
10	A Comparison of Average GPA Requirements--Overall, Secondary, and Elementary, 1982. . . .	28
11	A Comparison of the Number and Percentage of Institutions Using Quotas in Admission of Students, 1982 and 1972	29
12	Number of Students Admitted to Teacher Education Programs, 1980-1981	31

Tables		Page
13	Trends in Enrollment in Teacher Education Programs, by Number and Percentage of Institutions.	32
14	Enactment of Laws by States Regarding Teacher Admissions.	34
15	Recruitment Programs.	36
16	Types of Students Being Recruited for Teacher Education	36
17	Success of Recruitment.	37

A SURVEY OF CRITERIA FOR ADMITTING STUDENTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Introduction

A growing dissatisfaction with the public schools has emerged during the past decade. This dissatisfaction, expressed in various forms, such as public opinion polls, media features, and rejection of school levies, has been an impelling force in initiating trends such as competency testing, the call for educational accountability, and strengthened certification standards for teachers. Some educational leaders have appealed for the establishment of more rigorous criteria for admission to teacher education. Others have asked that criteria more appropriate for predicting teacher success be used.

In response to this state of dissatisfaction with public education, legislatures have enacted laws, state boards of education have issued mandates, and institutions that prepare teachers have taken initiatives to address these concerns. Among teacher preparation institutions, several factors complicate the efforts to ameliorate these problems. These include a decline in enrollment in teacher education programs, many of which are overstaffed, and a lack of consensus on criteria to be used in admitting candidates.

Those responsible for making decisions, both legislators and college officials, are hampered because they have little or no benchmark data from which to start their decision making processes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of teacher admissions in the teacher preparation institutions which are members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). A concomitant purpose was to determine, by comparison with a 1972 study on the same topic,[1] trends that appear to be emerging in teacher admissions.

More specifically, the study proposed to find answers to the following questions:

1. What methods are being used by AACTE institutions to admit students to teacher education? Are the methods of admitting students basically the same as they were in the 1972 study, and, if they are different, in what ways are they different?
2. What criteria are used by AACTE institutions in admitting students to teacher education? Are the criteria about the same that were found to be in use by the 1972 study? Are some old criteria being abandoned? Are there some new criteria emerging? Are the criteria more, or less, difficult for students to meet now than in the 1972 study?

3. Are the criteria that are being used screening out some of the applicants to teacher education? If so, what criteria are most often failed? Are students who fail the admissions criteria subsequently permitted to reapply? Are there instances where students are given final denial?
4. How prevalent is the use of the grade point average (GPA) in admitting students to teacher education? What student GPA requirements are used for admission? Is the GPA criterion for admission getting higher or lower?
5. Do institutions control the number of students admitted to teacher education or to certain programs in teacher education by the use of quotas?
6. What is the current status of the enrollment in teacher education programs among AACTE institutions? What is the trend in the enrollment over the past five years?
7. What initiatives are being taken to change the practices and policies of admitting students to teacher education? From what sources are these initiatives coming? State legislatures? State boards of education? Teacher training institutions? What is the substance of these initiatives, and what effect are these initiatives expected to have on the quantity and quality of the candidates who enter teacher education?
8. What efforts are being used to obtain better quality candidates for teacher education? What are some problems

involved in getting better candidates? What types of candidates are actively being recruited?

Delimitations of the Study

The focus of this study is on practices, policies, and trends involved in admitting students to teacher education programs. It does not attempt to treat problems or issues involved in the certification of teachers or the establishment of prerequisites for student teaching. even though these relate rather closely to teacher admissions.

Survey of the Literature

From the research surveyed, there appears to be a growing concern among teacher educators that there are students graduating from teacher training programs who are unusually weak in various skills fundamental to teaching. This concern was evident at the 1980 meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education held in Dallas, Texas. The Association passed two resolutions addressing this concern. One resolution supported a test of basic skills as a criterion for entry or continuance in teacher education programs. The other supported a program of assessment of professional skills as an exit requirement for teacher preparation programs.[2]

An evaluation of the effectiveness of admissions criteria currently in use also appears in the literature. Some articles decry the use of criteria too easily met and

the use of inappropriate criteria. For example, Doyle Watts calls current admissions criteria "meager standards, established at wretchedly inadequate levels or administered in such a careless fashion as to be literally useless."[3] Indeed, Harold A. Brubaker reported that most institutions in 1976 accepted more than 90 percent of their applicants.[4]

Data provided by the College Entrance Examination Board on national college bound seniors who select education as their first career choice show that their mean SAT verbal test scores declined from 418 in 1972-1973 to 389 in 1979-1980, a decline of 29 points. Their mean SAT math scores declined from 449 in 1972-1973 to 418 in 1979-1980, a decline of 31 points. The CEEB study also compares seniors selecting education as their first choice intended area of study with seniors selecting other intended areas in eleven various arts and science programs. The comparison shows that seniors selecting education ranked eleventh in this group of twelve on the verbal SAT scores in 1972-1973 and ranked last in their group in 1979-1980. An identical decline in ranking was reflected in the math scores.[5]

Another factor indicating a weakening of the quality of admissions criteria is grade inflation which has supposedly occurred during the past several years. If grade inflation is as high as it is reputed to be, it seems apparent that students who meet this criterion may actually be academically weaker than their GPAs indicate.

In a survey conducted at Western Kentucky University in 1981, Laman and Reeves found that the mean GPA for the undergraduate population at the University had increased from 2.46 in 1972 to a mean of 2.59 in 1980. At the same time, the mean composite ACT score of entering freshmen had shown a decrease from a mean composite ACT score of 18.4 in 1972 to a mean composite ACT score of 17.3 in 1980. Evidently academic aptitude reflected by ACT scores declined and academic aptitude reflected by the GPA increased. A comparison of academic measures obtained on a population of teacher education students at Western Kentucky University in 1974 and 1981 revealed that the composite ACT score had declined from a mean of 19.82 in 1974 to a mean composite ACT score of 17.71 in 1981. The mean GPA for this population in 1974 was 2.89 and 2.85 in 1981, a decline which is much smaller than the decline in the ACT scores.[6]

Even more concern is evident in the literature for what many believe is the inappropriateness of selection criteria. All too often, these educators protest, objective quantitative selection criteria are used heavily, or even exclusively. Martin Haberman notes that these criteria have been chosen, at least in part, because they are "inexpensive, efficient ways of screening large numbers of students."[7] A University of Nebraska Study Commission survey suggests that such criteria are less subject to legal challenge than are most subjective criteria.[8] On the whole, smaller institutions

are more likely to use the so-called "personal evaluations" than are larger universities, perhaps because a closer relationship exists between teachers and college students in smaller schools.[9]

The literature provides several recommendations that more significant selection criteria be employed. Haberman warns that more rigid application of existing criteria is not the answer to improved selection. Instead, present selection measures should be replaced by those which better predict teaching success.[10] Harry V. Barnard and Kathy R. Thornburg urge that greater attention be given to professional judgment as a selection technique.[11] Grace Muente comments that usual selection practices ignore such vital qualities as charisma and temperament.[12]

A second related concern that emerges is that too often admission is a one-time event. Haberman urges that selection be an ongoing process.[13] William Rabinowitz and Harold E. Mitzel recommend concentration on improving training programs, suggesting that such programs work better than selection procedures.[14] Barnard proposes an internship of one year and two-year provisional licenses before permanent certification.[15] These and other educators thus see selection as a long-term process.

The literature demonstrates widespread concern about teacher competency. Barnard notes that demands for competency testing evidence such public concern.[16]

While there is some agreement that admissions criteria as now commonly applied are too low, warnings emerge regarding attempts to raise them. One problem is the burden on those who apply selection criteria to show that they are not discriminatory. For example, Barnard and Thornburg note that Titles VI and IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibit discrimination on the bases of race, color, national origin, or sex. These regulations preclude the use of tests that have a disproportionally adverse effect on these groups.[17] The 1981 study by Laman and Reeves reported that if proposed selection criteria of a GPA of 2.5 on a four-point scale and a grade equivalency score of 12.5 on the California Achievement Test were adopted at Western Kentucky University, only 59 percent of the males and 21 percent of the Blacks presently entering the program would meet the combined criteria.[18] In light of pressures for increased numbers of male and Black teachers, these data are cause for concern. Furthermore, the study reinforced claims that prospective teachers' scores were declining in key areas.[19]

A review of the literature suggests that quotas might be helpful. Watts, for example, urges a statewide quota system.[20] Haberman cautions that student and job market demand are not adequate determinants of quotas, which he believes should derive from consideration of suitable faculty and program resources.[21]

Reluctance of teacher training institutions to impose quotas is seen by many as a self-protective device. Watts cites a pervasive institutional awareness that "further reduction in student enrollment will result in loss of additional funds and necessitate staff retrenchment."[22]

It is apparent that the whole issue of selection criteria is enormously complex. While this study does not address itself to all of these complexities, it does provide a much needed status report on present conditions in the United States. It not only serves as a current frame of reference by addressing many aspects of the total problem of teacher admissions, but, by updating a similar survey made in 1972, it reveals some trends that appear to be emerging in practices and policies of admitting students to teacher education programs. It is believed that this study may be useful to teacher training institutions on the threshold of making crucial decisions about teacher admissions criteria.

Method

The sample of institutions invited to participate in the survey were members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). A quota sampling procedure was used so that a representation from each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia was included and states with numerous institutions would be properly represented in the survey. One hundred forty-seven institutions in January, 1982, were sent letters (APPENDIX A) and questionnaires

(APPENDIX B) inviting their participation. A follow-up letter and another questionnaire were sent to those institutions that did not respond. Eventually, 124 of the 147 (84.4%) institutions responded. However, only 121 of the returned surveys were used. Two were not sufficiently complete, and one arrived too late to be included in the analysis. It is significant that all but five states in the United States were represented in this study. However, pertinent data were obtained from the other five states.

A questionnaire similar in content to the instrument of the 1972 study was used. It contained forty-one structured and unstructured sub-items grouped under fifteen item topics. Portions of the questionnaire, rather than lending themselves to statistical analyses, were used primarily for eliciting the true account of the situation in question. In order to bring structure to these open-ended responses it was necessary to analyze and categorize them. These findings were then placed in tables so that comparisons could be made and obvious findings noted. Since the purpose of the study was not to determine cause and effect but to describe existing conditions and compare them with previous conditions, only the most simple descriptive statistical measures were used.

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

The findings of this research are presented to correspond to the specific research questions posed in the Purpose

of the Study. The presentation of the data, a brief analysis of these data, and a commentary on the findings pertinent to each question are presented.

1. Method of admitting students to teacher education

The data indicate that the AACTE institutions, with few exceptions, have a formal system of admitting students to teacher education. The most common method used is admission by a committee. Carpenter's study in 1972 obtained a similar finding. Table 1 below shows very little difference between the results of the 1982 study and the 1972 study in the percentage of institutions admitting students by committees whose primary function is admitting students to teacher education. Since 1972 there has been only a slight increase in the percentage of institutions using program area committees to admit students to their program of teacher preparation.

TABLE 1

INSTITUTIONS USING COMMITTEES WHOSE PRIMARY FUNCTION IS TO ADMIT STUDENTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION, 1982 COMPARED TO 1972

	1982		1972	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	65	53.7	104	57.8
No	45	37.2	59	32.8
No, but Program Area Committees used	10	8.3	9	5.0
Other[a]	1	.8	0	0
No response	0	0	8	4.4
Totals	121	100.0	180	100.0

[a]One area in the teacher education program, special education, has an admissions committee.

The majority of those institutions (45 of 121, or 37.2%) who answered "No" to the use of a teacher admissions committee indicated that their formal admissions process was governed by a delegated administrator or some office of student services or by departmental decision. Although every institution had some means by which a person was admitted to teacher education, in one case such admission was based on the students' simply declaring for teacher education as they would choose a major or minor. Table 2 below lists the non-committee ways of admitting students to teacher education programs in 1982.

TABLE 2

METHODS OF ADMITTING STUDENTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION OTHER THAN BY COMMITTEE, 1982

Admitted by:	N
Designated administrator	20
Departmental administrator or faculty	13
University Office of Student Services	5
College-level committee or council	4
Individual student advisors	3
Student option	1
Total	45

2. Criteria used in admitting students to teacher education

The items on that portion of the 1982 study relating to criteria for admission to teacher education were similar to those in the 1972 survey even though differing formats were used. Criteria which were most commonly used in 1982 and 1972 are found in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF CRITERIA USED TO ADMIT STUDENTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION, 1982 AND 1972

Criteria	1982						1972					
	Yes		No		Other		Yes		No		No Response	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
(1) Pre-admissions Personal Interview	50	41.3	66	54.5	5	4.1	72	40.0	83	46.1	25	13.9
(2) Formal Application	111	91.7	10	8.3	0	0	164	91.1	14	7.8	2	1.1
(3) Written Recommendations[a]	61	50.4	55	45.5	5	4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
(4) Physical Examination	23	19.0	89	73.6	9	7.4	74	41.1	98	54.4	8	4.4
(5) Psychological Examination	8	6.6	108	89.3	5	4.1	23	12.8	151	83.8	6	3.3
(6) Speech Test	49	48.8	62	51.2	0	0	84	46.6	93	51.6	3	1.6
(7) Written Language Test[b]	46	38.0	66	54.5	9	7.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
(8) Standardized Tests	50	41.3	67	55.4	4	3.3	31	17.2	143	79.4	6	3.3

[a]See page 14 for explanation of 1972 data.

[b]The 1972 study used the term "Professional Tests" which included both written tests and standardized tests. The 1982 study used two classifications: written language test and standardized tests.

As might be expected, some institutions used multiple criteria, most used criteria that are listed in Table 3, some used only one or two, and some used criteria not found in this table but that are included in subsequent tables. Some institutions used rather demanding and explicit criteria, whereas a few regarded entry into teacher education the same as they would regard choosing any other major. Also, a few institutions held that a student could choose teacher education without meeting criteria beyond what is required to enter college.

Fewer than half (41.3%) of the institutions required a pre-admissions interview for admission to teacher education. This is about the same percentage found in the 1972 study.

Practically all of the institutions (91.7%) in the 1982 study required of candidates a formal application as a condition of being admitted to teacher education. The percentage found in 1982 was almost the same found in the 1972 study (91.1%).

In the 1982 study, 61 of 121 institutions (50.4%) said they required written recommendations for students as a condition of admission to the teacher education program. The percentage of the institutions with such a requirement in the 1972 study was not possible to determine because of the differences in the questionnaire format, but the investigators, after a careful examination of the responses in the 1972 study, are convinced that the number of institutions requiring

recommendations in 1972 was about the same as in the 1982 study.

Twenty-three institutions (19.0%) in 1982 required a physical examination as a condition for entering teacher education. This is a much lower percentage than was the case in the 1972 study in which 41.1 percent reported using a physical examination as a criterion. Evidently the physical examination is being used by fewer institutions than it previously was. Some institutions responded that although they did not require a physical examination as a prerequisite for entering teacher education such a requirement was made for all who entered college.

Psychological examinations were not commonly used as criteria for admission in 1972; only 23 of 180 institutions (12.8%) reported using them. They were used even less frequently in 1982; only 8 of 120 (6.6%) reported using them.

A speech test as a criterion for admission was used about as widely in 1982 as in 1972. In 1982, 48.8 percent of the institutions used a speech test, whereas in 1972 the percentage was 46.6.

In the 1982 survey, 46 of 121 institutions (38.0%) reported using a written language test as a criterion for admission to teacher education. Since the 1972 study did not use this criterion in its survey, no comparisons can be made.

One trend does appear to have emerged in the use of criteria for admitting students to teacher education: the

use of standardized tests. In the 1972 study only 31 of 180 institutions (17.2%) said they used such tests, while in the 1982 survey 50 of 121 (41.3%) said they did.

Although fifty institutions reported that they used standardized tests of specific basic skills as a criterion for admitting students to teacher education, some did not specify the name(s) of the particular test(s) used. The titles of the standardized tests reported to be used by institutions for obtaining criterion data can be found in APPENDIX C.

The grade point average (GPA) was found to be used extensively in both the 1982 and the 1972 studies. In the 1982 study, 115 of 121 institutions (95.0%) reported that they used the GPA for admission purposes. Six institutions did not respond to this item. In the 1972 study, 171 of 180 institutions (95.6%) reported that they used the GPA in some form or another. Nine institutions did not respond to this question. A more thorough treatment of the use of the GPA as a criterion for admission will be presented in a subsequent topic.

A variety of other criteria for admitting students to teacher education were found to be in use. Those that have not been mentioned in Table 3 can be found in APPENDIX D. Many of the criteria found in APPENDIX D can be classified as literacy and communication requirements which include the requirement of a specific minimum GPA, minimum cut-off scores

on standardized tests of basic skills, and a minimum achievement level in courses teaching verbal communication and mathematical skills.

Those criteria that appear to have remained at the same percentage level of use from 1972 to 1982 include the personal interview, formal application, speech test, written recommendation, and the GPA. Those criteria that appear to be used less extensively in 1982 as compared to 1972 are a physical examination and a psychological examination. The use of standardized tests appears to have increased significantly from 1972 to 1982.

Although the use of differing formats in the two studies makes it difficult to draw a full comparison with the 1972 study, there appears to have emerged a more extensive use of communication criteria for admission to teacher education. Such criteria take the forms of written language tests, English and speech courses, oral and written communication tests, departmental tests of written English and English usage, writing samples, and the requirement that students must attain a specified grade level in specific communication courses.

The use of speech tests for admitting students to teacher education was only slightly more prevalent in the 1982 than in the 1972 study. There is evidence, however, that this criterion has expanded to include a broader criterion, namely, that of skill in communication.

3. Criteria for admission to teacher education most often failed

There were 108 institutions which reported that some students failed to meet satisfactorily their admission criteria. Table 4 below presents the various criteria that institutions gave as most frequently failed by their teacher education candidates.

TABLE 4

INSTITUTIONS REPORTING THE CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION MOST OFTEN FAILED BY STUDENTS, 1982

Criteria		N
GPA		32
Literacy or communication skills:		
Written language test	14	
English proficiency test	5	
Basic communication skills test	1	
Reading/Speech test	2	
Speech course	2	
English course	1	
		25
Standardized tests (basic skills)		18
Standardized tests (math section)		11
Written recommendations		7
Personal interview		6
Application		4
National Teachers Examination		1
Not applicable		4
Total		108

The criterion that was reported as being most often failed was the GPA; it was mentioned by thirty-two institutions. The criterion that was next most frequently cited as being failed by candidates was a set of requirements which are grouped under the heading of literacy/communication skills.

However, it may be reasonably assumed that there is considerable overlapping among the criteria categories. For example, the GPA, communication skills, and a portion of the content of standardized tests of basic skills are all to a large extent concerned with literacy and communication.

Again, it is difficult to draw a valid comparison of the 1982 study, which used an open-ended response format to the item on "criteria most often failed by students," with the 1972 survey, which used structured items. Because of its high degree of item structure, the 1972 study obtained a much higher rate of response on this particular item than the 1982 study. However, the 1972 results do parallel the 1982 study in some areas relative to the types of criteria failed. Most often cited as reasons for failure in the 1972 study were scholarship and English usage. This corresponds to part of the findings of the 1982 study; in other areas, however, the parallel breaks down.

For example, several factors mentioned quite frequently by institutions in the 1972 study as contributing to the rejection of candidates for admission to teacher education were not mentioned in the 1982 study. Specifically, of the 180 institutions surveyed in the 1972 study, 113 (62.8%) mentioned personal integrity, 109 (60.6%) mentioned personality, and 102 (56.6%) mentioned health as factors contributing to rejection.

Perhaps these differences in the two studies indicate that there has been a drift away from the use of more subjective criteria in favor of more objective, explicit and defensible criteria.

In both studies most institutions permitted candidates who failed the admissions criteria to reapply for admission. In 1982, 110 of 121 institutions (90.0%) said they permitted re-application, while 5 (4.1%) said they did not. Six other institutions either did not respond to this item or gave answers which did not permit classification. Table 5 below presents the statistical data pertaining to this practice.

TABLE 5

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS REPORTING WHETHER CANDIDATES FOR ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION ARE ALLOWED TO REAPPLY FOR ADMISSION, 1982 COMPARED TO 1972

	Yes		No		Other		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1982	110	90.9	5	4.1	6	5.0	121	100
1972	161	89.4	9	5.0	10	5.6	180	100

In each of the two surveys, permitting students to reapply was contingent upon removing the condition that caused failure in the first place. Frequently this meant that a student had to improve his GPA, take some course to strengthen his communication skills, or retake a course in which a low grade was made.

In both studies institutions were asked if they gave what would be considered "final denials" to students who attempted to gain admission to teacher education. In the 1982 study, 96 of 121 institutions (79.3%) said they did, and 5 of 121 (4.1%) said they did not. In the 1972 study, 164 of 180 (91.1%) said they did, and 9 of 180 (4.0%) said they did not. In the 1982 study, 25 institutions (20.7%) either left this item blank, did not know, or gave unclear answers. In the 1972 study, 10 of 180 (4.6%) either gave no answer or gave unclear answers.

The validity of the responses to this item in both studies is somewhat suspect due to the numerous comments that were written in explaining the answers. It was evident that many of these so-called final denials were not in fact final but that the admission process remained open to those students who could find ways to meet the criteria that rejected them from the program originally. Table 6 below presents the number of institutions and the number of denials reportedly given to students in the academic year 1980-1981.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF FINAL DENIALS FOR ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION, 1980-1981

No. of Denials	No. of Institutions
140 +	2
130-139	1
120-129	1
110-119	0
100-109	0
90-99	1
80-89	1
70-79	4
60-69	1
50-59	10
40-49	6
30-39	5
20-29	14
10-19	15
1-9	24
0	11
Total no. of institutions issuing final denials	96
Institutions whose responses were left blank, were unclear, or said they did not know	25
Total no. of institutions	121

4. The use of the GPA in admitting students

On the topic of the GPA required for admission to teacher education, institutions were requested to indicate GPA requirements according to the following: overall GPA, GPA in major/minor (secondary), GPA in major/minor (elementary), and GPA in professional courses.

Overall GPA. In both the 1972 and 1982 studies, teacher training institutions relied on the overall GPA as a criterion for admission to teacher education programs. In the 1972 study, 171 of 180 institutions (95.0%) indicated they used GPA as a criterion for admission, but 9 did not answer. The same percentage was found in the 1982 study; 115 of 121 institutions (95.0%) said they used the GPA as a criterion, with 6 not answering. Table 7 below presents overall GPA comparative data for the two studies.

TABLE 7

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF INSTITUTIONS USING VARIOUS OVERALL GPAs AS A CRITERION FOR ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION, 1982 COMPARED TO 1972

	1982			1972		
GPA	N	%	Cum. %	N	%	Cum. %
3.20-.25	0			2	1.2	100.1
3.10-.15	0			1	.6	98.9
3.00-.05	0			1	.6	98.3
2.90-.95	2	1.7	99.9	0		
2.80-.85	1	.9	98.2	0		
2.70-.75	2	1.7	97.3	0		
2.60-.65	0			0		
2.50-.55	36	31.3	95.6	20	11.7	97.7
2.40-.45	1	.9	64.3	0		
2.30-.35	3	2.6	63.4	5	2.9	86.0
2.20-.25	35	30.4	60.8	48	28.1	83.1
2.10-.15	5	4.3	30.4	7	4.1	55.0
2.00-.05	30	26.1	26.1	87	50.9	50.9
Totals	115[a]	99.9		171[b]	100.1	
None Given[c]	6			9		

[a]The 1982 data yield a M = 2.24, Mdn. = 2.20-.25, and Mo. = 2.50-.55.

[b]The 1972 data yield a M = 2.16, Mdn. = 2.00-.05, and Mo. = 2.00-.05.

[c]None Given is not used in determining the M or percentages.

In the 1982 study an analysis of the GPAs required for admission to teacher education from the 115 of 121 institutions reporting this information shows the following measures: mean = 2.24, median = 2.20-.25, and mode = 2.50-.55. In the 1972 study an analysis of the GPAs required for admission from 171 of 180 institutions reporting this information shows the following measures: mean = 2.16, median = 2.00-.05, and mode = 2.00-.05. In each of the three measures used, the 1982 results are higher than those for 1972.

Using the cumulative percentage data, it can be noted that in the 1972 study as many as 50.9 percent of the institutions permitted admission to students with a minimum overall GPA of 2.00, whereas in the 1982 study only 26.1 percent of the institutions permitted admission at this level. In the 1972 study only 11.7 percent of the institutions required an overall GPA of at least 2.50; in the 1982 study the percentage requiring this criterion level had increased to 31.3 percent.

A comparison of the data from the two studies would suggest that there has been a definite increase in the overall GPA criterion level from 1972 to 1982. One might be inclined to conclude that the scholarship requirements for admission to teacher education had become more demanding. However, if grade inflation is taken into account, this may not be the case. Some studies, as mentioned in the introduction to this study, indicate that the GPA in institutions of higher education has increased in recent years but that student scholarship as measured by the SAT and ACT has actually declined.

Major/Minor GPA minimum requirements--secondary. The mean GPA required in the major/minor field at the secondary level for admission of students to teacher education in the 1982 study was 2.37; the median, 2.50-.55; the mode, 2.50-.55. These measures are somewhat higher than for the 1972 study in which the mean was 2.28; the median, 2.20-.25; and the mode, 2.00-.05.

The cumulative percentage data reveal that in the 1972 study as many as 39.1 percent of the institutions required a mean GPA of 2.00 in the major/minor field for admission to teacher education, whereas in the 1982 study the percentage of institutions allowing this relatively low criterion was only 19.5. In the 1972 study, only 23.7 percent of the institutions required a GPA as high as 2.50 in the major/minor, but in the 1982 study this percentage had increased to 52.4. Table 8 presents the major/minor GPA minimum requirements for secondary teacher education students.

TABLE 8

MAJOR/MINOR GPA MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS, 1982 COMPARED TO 1972

	1982			1972		
GPA	N	%	Cum. %	N	%	Cum. %
3.20-.25	0			2	1.3	100.0
3.10-.15	0			0		
3.00-.05	2	2.4	99.8	2	1.3	98.7
2.90-.95	0			0		
2.80-.85	1	1.2	97.4	0		
2.70-.75	3	3.6	96.2	4	2.6	97.4
2.60-.65	0			0		
2.50-.55	43	52.4	92.6	37	23.7	94.8
2.40-.45	0			0		
2.30-.35	1	1.2	40.2	5	3.2	71.0
2.20-.25	14	17.1	39.0	42	26.9	67.9
2.10-.15	2	2.4	21.9	3	1.9	41.0
2.00-.05	16	19.5	19.5	61	39.1	39.1
Totals	82[a]	99.8		156[b]	100.0	
None given or not specific	39			24		

[a]The 1982 data yield a M = 2.37, Mdn. = 2.50-.55, and Mo. = 2.50-.55.

[b]The 1972 data yield a M = 2.28, Mdn. = 2.20-.25, and Mo. = 2.00-.05.

An examination of the comparative data of both studies shows an increase in the 1982 GPA criterion in the major/minor field (secondary) for admission to teacher education. Once again, however, one could hardly conclude that this increase in the GPA criterion represents a strengthening of the scholastic requirements for admission when grade inflation is taken into account.

If one examines Tables 7 and 8 which deal with comparative GPAs required in 1972 and 1982, it can be observed that

the 1972 study presents a few institutions who report a GPA requirement that is quite high by usual admission standards. No such level of GPA requirement was found in the 1982 study. Whether these reportings of very high GPAs were errors or whether a few institutions did have GPAs this high cannot be determined. Despite these few very high GPA requirements shown in the 1972 study, the averages (mean, median, and mode) are still lower than those in 1982.

Major/Minor GPA requirements--elementary. Since no data on the elementary students' major/minor requirements were available from the 1972 study, no comparison can be made with the GPA requirements in the present study. However, by comparing the data in Table 9 below with data from Table 8 (Major/Minor--Secondary) one can observe that the requirements for secondary students appear slightly higher. This is not the case when the comparison is made with the overall GPA requirements for admission.

GPA minimum requirements--professional courses. The professional courses GPA scholastic requirement was not treated due to the infrequency of responses to the questionnaire item. The failure to respond probably was because in many institutions few or no education courses are taken prior to admission to teacher education.

TABLE 9

MAJOR/MINOR GPA MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS, 1982

GPA	N	%	Cum. %
2.80-.85	1	1.2	100.1
2.70-.75	2	2.5	98.9
2.60-.65	0		
2.50-.55	36	45.0	96.4
2.40-.45	0		
2.30-.35	3	3.8	51.4
2.20-.25	24	30.0	47.6
2.10-.15	3	3.8	17.6
2.00-.05	11	13.8	13.8
Totals	80[a]	100.1	
None given or not specific	41		

[a]These data yield a M = 2.305, Mdn. = 2.30-.35, and Mo. = 2.50-.55.

See Table 10 below for a comparison of the three requirements on the basis of three measures of central tendency.

TABLE 10

A COMPARISON OF AVERAGE GPA REQUIREMENTS--OVERALL, SECONDARY, AND ELEMENTARY--1982

GPA Requirement	Mean	Median	Mode
Overall	2.24	2.20-.25	2.50-.55
Secondary Major/Minor	2.37	2.50-.55	2.50-.55
Elementary Major/Minor	2.30	2.30-.35	2.50-.55

5. The use of quotas in admitting students to teacher education programs

A rather small percentage of the institutions indicated that they placed quotas on the number of students admitted from certain major and minor areas. The response was much the same in the 1972 study. Table 11 below presents the number and percentage of institutions using quotas to regulate the admission of students to teacher education. Response measures from the 1972 study on this item are also presented for comparison purposes.

TABLE 11

A COMPARISON OF THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS USING QUOTAS IN ADMISSION OF STUDENTS, 1982 AND 1972

	Yes		No		No Ans.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1982	17	14.0	100	82.6	4	3.3	121	99.9
1972	25	13.8	145	80.6	10	5.6	180	100.0

An analysis of the open-ended responses relative to the programs on which quotas have been placed shows that more institutions (10 in all) placed quotas on special education programs than any other program. Other programs mentioned on which quotas were placed were as follows: elementary education--3 institutions; early childhood education and English--2 institutions each; physical education, mathematics, recreation, health education, and social studies--1 institution each.

One institution reported having an overall quota for teacher education. Another institution said quotas were established years ago for all majors and minors presumably in order to limit staff in anticipation of the coming enrollment decline. Three institutions maintained that although they had no quotas for programs, they did counsel all candidates about the teacher supply and demand in the various teaching areas.

In comparison, the 1972 survey indicated that five institutions had placed quotas on special education programs. Various other programs on which quotas were placed by institutions were art, English (2 institutions), social studies (2 institutions), secondary education (3 institutions). Men's physical education, physical education, and art were mentioned by one institution each in this earlier study.

In comparing the data obtained from the 1982 survey with the survey of 1972, it becomes apparent that there has been little change in the percentage of the institutions that use quotas to regulate the number of student admissions. A reason quotas were not being used more was given by one respondent who said that due to media coverage of the oversupply of teachers there was now no need for quotas.

6. Number of students admitted to teacher education programs

In the 1982 survey, institutions were asked to indicate the number of students admitted to their teacher education programs during the school year 1980-1981. Table 12

below presents the data obtained from 114 institutions that gave a quantitative answer. A total of seven gave other than a quantitative response or did not respond.

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS, 1980-1981

Students Admitted	No. of Institutions
1200 or more	4
1100-1199	1
1000-1099	2
900-999	0
800-899	2
700-799	3
600-699	3
500-599	8
400-499	12
300-399	18
200-299	23
100-199	20
Less than 100	18
Total institutions responding	114[a]
No response	7

[a]Median = 300-399; mode = 200-299.

The number of students that were admitted to the institutions surveyed varied widely, with the median being in the 300-399 range and the mode in the 200-299 range. The mean was not computed due to the effect that a few universities with extremely large admissions would have in distorting this measure.

Institutions were asked to comment briefly on the trend in the number of admissions to their programs over the past five years. Ninety-seven institutions responded and

twenty-four did not. A classification of comments on the trend in enrollment at their institutions is presented in Table 13 below.

TABLE 13

TRENDS IN ENROLLMENT IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS, BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF INSTITUTIONS

Trend	N	%
Significant decline	11	11.3
Decline	46	47.4
Decline but now stabilized	10	10.3
Decline slight	5	5.2
Decline only in special areas	7	7.2
Declined but now up slightly	3	3.1
Stable	7	7.2
Increase (special areas)	8	8.2
Totals	97	100.0
Not responding	24	

Eleven institutions indicated that they had had a significant decrease in enrollment during the past five years. One institution said that its enrollment in 1976 was 1300 and in 1981 was 300. Another indicated that its enrollment had decreased 60 percent; yet another, 50 percent. The decline appears to be more drastic in secondary education than in elementary, early childhood or special education programs. One institution indicated a decline in secondary enrollment of 43 percent. Several indicated a decline of about 40 percent.

Of the 97 institutions responding, 79, or 81.4 percent, indicated a decline in enrollment--from a "significant

decrease in enrollment" through "down but appears to be stabilizing." There may be a slight indication, however, of a "bottoming out" of the decline in enrollment as indicated by the 7 respondents who reported a stable enrollment, the 8 who reported a slight increase in certain programs in the past year or so, and the 3 who reported a decline but said they are now experiencing a modest enrollment increase.

Of the eight institutions reporting increased enrollment in specific programs, three said their increased enrollment was in their special education programs, three reported increases in their programs of elementary education, three in physical education, and one in its learning behavior disorders program.

7. Initiatives being taken to change the practices and policies of admitting students to teacher education

Institutions surveyed were asked the question "Has your state legislature, during the past five years, enacted laws pertaining to teacher admissions?" An analysis of the responses disclosed that most of the reported legislation effected changes in requirements concerning the certification of teachers. Very few changes regarding teacher admissions have been addressed by state legislatures. Table 14 below shows that four state legislatures have enacted laws, three states have bills pending, and forty-four have not dealt legislatively with the subject.

TABLE 14

ENACTMENT OF LAWS BY STATES REGARDING TEACHER ADMISSIONS

Responses	No. of States
No	44
Yes	4
Pending	3
Total	51[a]

[a]Includes the District of Columbia

A question related to the previous one on legislative changes regarding admission to teacher education was asked pertaining to changes mandated by state boards of education (or similar governing bodies). Responses indicated that nine state boards of education had mandated changes affecting the admission of students to teacher education. These nine states are Alabama, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, Tennessee, Virginia and Washington. In addition, the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors in North Carolina have passed a resolution to develop and implement pre-teacher education screening devices in the basic skills.

Seven other state boards either had issued mandates affecting the admission to teacher education but the mandates had not yet gone into effect or they are on the verge of issuing a mandate. These states are Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Texas, and West Virginia. Missouri's State Board of Education has both mandated

strengthened admissions requirements and is still in the process of establishing basic skills test requirements.

The question, "Has your institution during the past three years made any changes in policy regarding the criteria for admission to teacher education?", was asked each institution surveyed. Sixty-five of 121 (53.7%) answered "Yes," 52 (43.0%) answered "No," and 4 (3.3%) either did not answer or gave answers that were not classifiable in a yes-no format.

There appears to be a consensus among those institutions affected by strengthened admissions criteria, whether the new criteria were legislated at the state level, mandated by state boards of education, or effected at the institution level, that the new criteria will result in a more limited enrollment, at least temporarily. They agree, also, that the quality of students enrolled in teacher education programs will be significantly enhanced.

8. Recruitment efforts for quality candidates for admission to teacher education

Fewer than half of the respondents indicated that their institution has an active program of recruitment for candidates to teacher education. Table 15 below shows that 53, or 43.8 percent, of the institutions replied "Yes"; 64, or 52.8 percent, responded "No"; and 4 of the respondents either did not answer or gave an answer that was not classifiable.

TABLE 15

RECRUITMENT PROGRAMS

Responses	N	%
Yes	53	43.8
No	64	52.8
Other/no response	4	3.3
Totals	121	100.0

The respondents were asked to indicate what special types of students were being actively recruited. Table 16 shows the number of institutional responses relative to types of students being recruited.

TABLE 16

TYPES OF STUDENTS BEING RECRUITED FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Responses	No. of Institutions
High scholarship students	18
Students in certain program areas	11
Students in general	8
Students of racial/ethnic groups	7
Students with interest/aptitude for teaching	6
Returning adults	3
Junior college graduates	3
Students who show uniqueness/are well rounded	2
Students considering changing majors	1
Graduate students	1

Table 16 shows that those institutions which have programs of recruitment, in addition to recruiting in general, are specifically recruiting students of high scholarship,

students for certain program areas (e.g., math and science), and students from specific racial and ethnic backgrounds.

When asked what success the institutions had had in recruiting students, they gave answers that varied from "very good" or "excellent" to "poor" or "not pleased." A fairly large number of institutions (18, or 38.3%) indicated only average to fair success in their recruitment efforts.

TABLE 17

SUCCESS OF RECRUITMENT

Responses	No. of Institutions
Very good or excellent	4
Good; quite successful	9
Reasonable; average or moderate; fair	18
Minimal; slightly	5
Good in certain areas, poor in others	1
Too early to tell; can't tell	8
Poor; not pleased; not very successful	2

Some positive comments about the success of recruitment included the following:

> "Increased enrollment 5 percent."
>
> "Recruitment seems to offset negative advice students get from peers, parents and counselors."
>
> "Speech pathology results great. Okay for Special Education."

Some negative comments indicating poor results were as follows:

> "Odds are against Education in recruiting most capable students."

"Hard to compete with industry."

"Can't compete well due to low salaries for teachers."

"High salaries in other fields affecting recruitment."

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of teacher admissions in institutions which are members of the AACTE. A concomitant purpose was to determine, by a comparison with a national study in 1972 on the same topic, what trends in teacher education are emerging.

A questionnaire similar in most respects to the 1972 instrument was used. It invited responses, both structured and unstructured, from key people in the teacher training program in each institution. One hundred and forty-seven institutions from all states and the District of Columbia were sent questionnaires. Replies from one hundred twenty-four institutions were received; one hundred twenty-one were used in the study.

The findings of this study were organized according to specific topical questions that were to be answered. After a presentation and analysis of the data, a brief commentary was given. A summary of the significant findings pertaining to the following topics is presented below.

1. Method of admitting students

With few exceptions the institutions surveyed have a system through which students are admitted to teacher

education. Most institutions use a committee in the admissions process, usually a teacher admissions committee which services all teacher education programs, but in some institutions the admissions process is controlled by each department having a program of teacher training. In some institutions student admissions are governed, or at least processed, by an administrator or service officer, but these are not as common as committees for admitting students. Actually, very little has changed since 1972 in the process used for admitting students to teacher education.

2. Criteria used in admitting students to teacher education

The most common criteria were the GPA (used by 95%) and the formal application (used by 91.7%). Other criteria used less frequently were in order of frequency: written recommendations, speech tests, standardized tests, informal written language tests, physical examinations and psychological examinations. There appears to be a trend toward the increased use of various informal written language tests and standardized tests to ascertain the proficiency of the student in the basic skills of language and mathematics. Criteria that appear to be used less frequently since the 1972 study are the physical and psychological examinations.

3. Criteria for admission to teacher education most often failed

The criterion most frequently reported to be the reason for denial of admission was the GPA. Other criteria failed

were standardized tests, informal written language tests, and required communication courses such as English and speech. Most often cited as reasons for failure in the 1972 survey were scholarship and English usage. Criteria cited as frequently being failed in 1972 but not in 1982 were personality, personal integrity, and health. This change suggests that since 1972 there has been an abandonment of the use of somewhat subjective criteria and a greater reliance on more objective and defensible criteria.

The number of students who fail to meet the admissions criteria was small except in a very few institutions. In practically all institutions students who fail such criteria are permitted to re-apply for admission to the teacher education program if the condition for the failure is removed. Final denial does occur--but rather infrequently.

4. The use of the GPA in admitting students

The overall GPA required for admission to teacher education programs was higher in 1982 than in 1972. However, when grade inflation is taken into account such GPA increases must be discounted.

5. The use of quotas in admitting students to teacher education programs

A rather small percentage of the institutions (14.0%) in 1982 indicated they placed quotas on the number of students that could be admitted to certain programs in teacher

education. The percentage was about the same as in the 1972 study, 13.8 percent. The programs in which quotas were imposed were special education, ten instances; elementary education, two instances; early childhood education, two instances; and English, two instances. Physical education, mathematics, recreation, health education, and social studies were mentioned once each. The programs in which quotas were imposed in 1972 are similar to those in which quotas were imposed in 1982. No trends appear to be emerging in the use of quotas or the types of programs on which quotas are placed. Perhaps declining student enrollments coupled with program overstaffing with faculty prevents serious consideration of quotas.

6. Number of students admitted to teacher education programs

The number of students being admitted to teacher education has decreased markedly since 1972. This downward trend is due more to fewer students applying for admission than to criteria that are more demanding. A few institutions report the decline as having abated and the enrollment now stabilizing.

The number of students admitted to the different institutions varied widely, with the median being in the 300-399 class interval and the mode in the 200-299 class interval, statistics which indicate a positively skewed distribution.

7. Initiatives being taken to change the practices and policies of admitting students to teacher education

Most of the initiatives being taken by state legislatures were focused at the certification level rather than at the admissions level. As of January, 1982, however, four state legislatures had enacted laws pertaining to teacher admissions, and three states had bills pending.

State boards of education have directed most of their initiatives at requirements to be met before certification or before student teaching. They have in nine states, however, mandated changes affecting teacher admissions. Seven other state boards have either issued mandates which have not yet gone into effect or are now on the verge of issuing such mandates.

Teacher training institutions were taking more initiatives in teacher admissions than were state legislatures or state boards of education; 53 of 121, or 43.8 percent, reported doing so. However, many of these initiatives by institutions were coming about as a result of actions being taken or being considered by state legislatures or state boards of education.

8. Recruitment efforts to get quality candidates for admission to teacher education

As a general rule, teacher training institutions were not doing much to recruit desirable candidates for entry into teacher education. Less than one-half (43.8%) of the

institutions have an active program of recruitment. Fewer have recruitment success that they characterize as good or excellent. Recruited most frequently by these institutions are prospects described as students of high scholarship, students in certain program areas such as mathematics and science, and students of specific racial or ethnic groups.

Discussion

Admitting students to teacher education is a serious professional matter. It should be recognized as something more than a clerical job of determining whether prerequisites such as required courses, number of college hours, GPA, and test scores have been attained by the candidate. The admissions process should be administered by experienced and capable professionals who can provide wise counsel, suggest sources available for personal and professional development, and use sound judgment in applying criteria to individual cases.

The admissions process is too important to be left entirely to professional teacher educators. A broader perspective is needed in making policies and establishing practices. Admission should be a joint activity in which several interested parties can participate. For example, school administrators, public school teachers, parents, college students, and faculty from academic departments should be represented.

Of major concern should be the selection of those criteria that best identify the potential strengths and weaknesses of candidates. Numerical scores alone do not predict teaching success. Nonetheless, a good prospective teacher ought to be able to meet admissions standards on valid examinations at the level most institutions require.

Once it has been shown that candidates cannot meet the criteria, they should be denied admission. Admission to teacher education, like admission to schools of law or medicine, is not an inalienable right. Furthermore, to allow the same candidate unlimited opportunities to qualify is impractical and unfair. It is impractical because it is time consuming and expensive to process the same applicant repeatedly. It is unfair because it may keep a prospect dangling with false hope. But for an unsuitable applicant eventually to slip in is wrong for all concerned: for the profession, whose image will further suffer; for the applicant himself, whose unsuitability will make him at best uncomfortable, at worst a misfit; and, most importantly, for his future students, whose education will be hampered by the limitations of their teacher.

It is vital that all concerned be encouraged to regard admissions criteria positively. Applicants should regard those standards as means by which they can demonstrate competency and as devices to make sure that others admitted to teacher education are as well qualified as they themselves

are. One feels pride in belonging to a select group; conversely, he may feel resentment when criteria seem to be a meaningless hurdle only momentarily slowing the progress of those whose abilities are seriously limited. If standards are carefully established, clearly publicized and fairly enforced, those who meet these standards will have a sense of worth. The education profession needs to foster that sense of worth.

Economists frequently warn that in the money market bad money chases out the good. Educators could say with equal truth that in the teaching profession bad teachers chase out or keep out the good. Educators often complain of the difficulty of recruiting the very best prospects. The problem seems to derive mainly from a combination of incentives to pursue other careers and a lack of incentive to choose teaching. Other occupations frequently offer greater financial rewards, less stress, and more prestige. To attract the best, educators will have to make teaching more appealing. Since the profession cannot self-determine its financial status and alone can do little to eliminate stress caused from social changes such as drug use and lawlessness, enhancing prestige seems to offer a recruitment measure that might work.

Of course, not everyone who should be a teacher decides to teach. Educators at all levels should watch for likely prospects and perhaps encourage them to consider teaching.

If recruitment agencies at teacher training institutions are apprized of such promising students, it might well produce a significant increase in superior teacher candidates.

One suggestion made in the literature survey but not frequently implemented is that admissions should be an on-going process. If a student, once in, stays in regardless, problems are certain to arise. There must be quality checks along the way. It is irresponsible for an institution to allow a preparing teacher to complete his education, presumably satisfactorily, only to fail the exit examinations and thus be refused certification.

Nor is GPA a quality guarantee. A student may do well in a course for a variety of reasons (cheating, cramming, poor tests, casual grading) that indicate more than his true ability. Furthermore, a course grade is a more accurate indication of how well a student performed as a student (i.e., learned from others) than a prediction of how well he would perform as a teacher (i.e., will get others to learn from him).

Obviously, a prospective teacher needs proficiency in the basic skills, and standardized tests measure knowledge germane to these skills. The problem, however, is that such objective tests prove only a knowledge of such things as facts, rules and relationships. They fail to measure how well a person can or will express that knowledge accurately and clearly to others. One may do well on such a test, but

be unable--or unwilling--to practice those skills on a daily basis in the classroom.

There is widespread agreement that teachers need to demonstrate ability in areas other than professional knowledge. The difficulty arises over how to determine the applicant's aptitudes and abilities in those other areas. The ability to develop rapport with students, to cope with pressure, to manage classrooms effectively and efficiently are indisputably necessary teacher skills. Yet, it is very difficult to test objectively for these, and at the time a candidate seeks admission to teacher education there have seldom been opportunities to measure these qualities subjectively. This problem suggests a need to make selection an ongoing process as an integral part of the teacher education program.

Though most agree that final denial of admission is sometimes necessary and desirable, evidence from this survey shows that it seldom occurs. Many factors contribute to the rarity of final denial. Sometimes educators are not convinced of the validity of the selection criteria; sometimes the criteria are vague; sometimes there is fear of legal or other repercussions. No one wants to be cast in the role of villain, damaging a student's self-concept, delaying or preventing graduation, or even preventing acceptance of a lucrative job offer. For denial to occur when it should, institutions will have to formulate clear policies known to all involved and eliminate the pressures now put on individuals who have to make the crucial decisions.

That enrollments are down in most teacher education programs is the reason frequently cited for not imposing quotas on programs where a surplus of teachers already exists. Many teacher education programs were staffed during the time of increasing enrollments; now any reduction in the number of students admitted to a program would result in faculty losing their jobs. It is rather interesting to note that the excuse given for not using quotas in the early 1960's was that there was a teacher shortage and not enough students in teacher education to meet the demand. It appears that each era has its own alibi. Perhaps institutions created by society to serve society eventually ought to "bite the bullet" and make a decision to serve the interests that are best for society. An institution that chooses too long to disregard the best interests of society may lose much of its freedom to make its own decisions.

Several initiatives are being taken to deal with the problem of obtaining better quality teacher candidates and insuring competence of those candidates that become certified. These initiatives are in some cases hasty reactions to media exposures and public pressures. Too often they are in the form of simply "doing something" or doing more of what hasn't been working well in the past. The survey suggests that teacher training institutions are more often initiating corrective measures than are state boards of education and state legislatures. This is a positive sign, for when legislation

is enacted it is a sign that the general public is disturbed with the present circumstances or is not satisfied that proper measures will be taken or will be taken with sufficient speed.

Teacher educators must awaken to the fact that a problem exists which reflects a concern of the public with the quality of public school teachers and a lack of confidence in the institutions that train them. If this problem is not given the serious attention it deserves in the form of sound research, scholarly discussion, and bold but wise leadership, there may be serious consequences. Teacher education might become controlled by forces outside the profession and its programs altered along lines inconsistent with the best interests of those whom education serves.

Footnotes

[1]James A. Carpenter, Survey of the Criteria for Selection of Undergraduate Candidates for Admission to Teacher Education (Bowling Green, Ky.: Western Kentucky University, 1972). ERIC: ED 070 758.

[2]J. T. Sandefur, "Competency Assessment in Teacher Education: The State of the Scene of the States," presented at the Conference on Competency Assessment in Teacher Education: Making it Work, Lexington, Ky., November 16-18, 1980, p. 3, citing resolutions passed at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in Dallas, Texas, February, 1980.

[3]Doyle Watts, "Admissions Standards for Teacher Preparatory Programs: Time for a Change," Phi Delta Kappan, LXII, 2, October, 1980, p. 120.

[4]Harold A. Brubaker, Who Should Become a Teacher? Current Student Selection/Retention Policies of Teacher Education Institutions (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University, March, 1976). ERIC: ED 115 608.

[5]W. Timothy Weaver, "Potpourri: The Talent Pool in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, XXXII (May-June, 1981), p. 32.

[6]Archie E. Laman and Dorothy E. Reeves, Study of Bias in Teacher Education, III (Bowling Green, Ky.: Western Kentucky University, 1981), p. 17.

[7]Martin Haberman, "Needed: New Guidelines for Teacher Candidate Selection," Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, 3 (Fall, 1974), p. 235.

[8]"Validity of Criteria Questioned," Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, 3 (Fall, 1974), p. 237.

[9]T. Uno, T. R. Blackwell and G. Leonardson, "Admission Criteria of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation," Education, CI (Summer, 1981), p. 319.

[10]Haberman, op. cit.

[11]Harry V. Barnard and Kathy R. Thornburg, "Selective Admissions in Teacher Education: A Critical Reappraisal," TEASE, III, 2 (1980), p. 41.

[12]Grace Muente, "Let's Be More Selective with Student Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, 3 (Fall, 1974), p. 236.

[13]Haberman, op. cit.

[14]William Rabinowitz and Harold E. Mitzel, "Some Observations on the Selection of Students for Teacher Education Programs," Journal of Teacher Education, XII, 2 (June, 1981), p. 158.

[15]Harry V. Barnard, "Assessing Teacher Competencies: A Proposal," UAB Educational Research Review (Spring, 1981), pp. 44-45.

[16]Ibid., p. 42.

[17]Barnard and Thornburg, op. cit., p. 38.

[18]Laman and Reeves, op. cit., pp. 15-16.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Watts, op. cit., p. 121.

[21]Haberman, op. cit.

[22]Watts, op. cit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnard, Harry V. "Assessing Teacher Competencies: A Proposal." UAB Educational Research Review (Spring, 1981), pp. 42-45.

Barnard, Harry V., and Thornburg, Kathy R. "Selective Admissions in Teacher Education: A Critical Reappraisal." TEASE, III, 2 (1980), pp. 36-42.

Brubaker, Harold A. Who Should Become a Teacher? Current Student Selection/Retention Policies of Teacher Education Institutions. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University, March, 1976. ERIC: ED 115 608.

Carpenter, James A. Survey of the Criteria for Selection of Undergraduate Candidates for Admission to Teacher Education. Bowling Green, Ky.: Western Kentucky University, 1972. ERIC: ED 070 758.

Haberman, Martin. "Needed: New Guidelines for Teacher Candidate Selection." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, 3 (Fall, 1974), pp. 234-235.

Laman, Archie E., and Reeves, Dorothy E. Study of Bias in Teacher Education, III. Bowling Green, Ky.: Western Kentucky University, 1981. 45 pp. ERIC: ED 212 591.

Muente, Grace. "Let's Be More Selective with Student Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, 3 (Fall, 1974), pp. 236-237.

Rabinowitz, William, and Mitzel, Harold E. "Some Observations on the Selection of Students for Teacher Education Programs." Journal of Teacher Education, XII, 2 (June, 1961), pp. 157-164

Sandefur, J. T. "Competency Assessment in Teacher Education: The State of the Scene of the States." Presented at the Conference on Competency Assessment in Teacher Education: Making it Work, Lexington, Ky., November 16-18, 1980.

Uno, T.; Blackwell, T. R.; and Leonardson, G. "Admission Criteria of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation." Education, CI, 4 (Summer, 1981), pp. 315-321.

"Validity of Criteria Questioned." Journal of Teacher Education, XXV, 3 (Fall, 1974), p. 237.

Weaver, W. Timothy. "Potpourri: The Talent Pool in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, XXXII, 3 (May-June, 1981), pp. 32-35.

Watts, Doyle. "Admissions Standards for Teacher Preparatory Programs: Time for a Change." Phi Delta Kappan, LXII, 2 (October, 1980), pp. 120-122.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Dear _____:

HERE IS SOMETHING THAT MAY BE OF MUTUAL INTEREST AND VALUE TO BOTH OF US. We propose to update a study done in 1972 by James A. Carpenter of our University. His study was entitled "A Survey of the Criteria for the Selection of Undergraduate Candidates for Admission to Teacher Training." We feel that this updated study will provide information about a problem whose dimensions appear to be changing at the present time. We believe that this information will be useful both to our own institution and to other institutions who are on the threshold of making crucial decisions about teacher education in general and teacher admissions criteria in particular.

We plan to survey those institutions of higher education in the United States that are prominent in the preparation of teachers. Our focus is two-fold: namely, to determine the present status of the criteria that are used for admissions to teacher education and, by a comparison of this information with the 1972 findings, to determine what trends appear to be emerging in teacher admissions.

We are using a questionnaire that addresses the same basic concerns as did the 1972 instrument except that we have modified the questionnaire to make it shorter and easier to answer. Most of the items can be answered by simply checking "yes" or "no", with only a few requiring a written response. A few minutes' time is all that will be required of you or someone you designate to complete the questionnaire.

If you will kindly oblige us by filling out the questionnaire, we promise to send you a copy of the major findings of this study when completed, if you so desire. Enclosed is a self-addressed envelope for your convenience in returning your contribution to our study. Your promptness in returning this will be appreciated very much.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Archie Laman, Professor
Secondary Education

Dr. Dorothy E. Reeves, Associate
Professor, Education Foundations

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

CRITERIA FOR ADMISSION OF UNDERGRADUATE

STUDENTS TO TEACHER EDUCATION

Name of Institution:_____

I. Do you have a committee whose primary function is to admit students to your teacher education program?---------- Yes___ No___

If NO, who governs the admission process?_____

_____

_____

II. Do you require the following of your candidates for admission to teacher education?

(1) a pre-admissions personal interview---------- Yes___ No___

(2) a formal-type application---------- Yes___ No___

(3) written recommendations---------- Yes___ No___

(4) a physical examination---------- Yes___ No___

(5) a psychological examination---------- Yes___ No___

(6) a speech test---------- Yes___ No___

(7) a written language test---------- Yes___ No___

(8) standardized test(s) of specific basic skills Yes___ No___

If YES, please specify the standardized test(s) used:_____

_____

(9) other (specify):_____

_____

III. Of all the criteria for admission to teacher education in Item II, which one(s) is/are failed most often by your students?

IV. If your institution uses a 4.00 grading scale, please respond to items (1) through (4) below. If it utilizes some other scale, complete (5) below.

The grade point averages required for admission to teacher education in your institution (4.00 scale) are:

(1) Overall---------- _____

(2) In major and/or minor (secondary program)--- _____

(3) In major and/or minor (elementary program)-- _____

(4) In professional education courses---------- _____

(5) If your institution uses other than a 4.00 grading scale, please specify scale used and the specific grade point averages required.

V. Do you place quotas on the number of students admitted from certain major or minor areas?----- Yes___ No___

Explanation: _____

_____

_____

VI. Do you permit unsuccessful candidates to re-apply for admission?---------- Yes___ No___

If YES, under what condition(s)?_____

_____

VII. Has your state legislature, during the past few years, enacted laws pertaining to teacher admissions?---------- Yes___ No___

If YES,

(1) please state the gist of such laws.

(2) please tell what effect you think such laws will have on the quality of your teacher education program and the number of candidates who are admitted.

VIII. Has your State Board of Education (or similar governing body) mandated any changes affecting teacher admissions during the past few years?-- Yes___ No___

If YES,

(1) please state the gist of such mandates.

(2) please tell what effect you think such mandates will have on the quality of your teacher education program and the number of candidates admitted.

IX. Has your institution during the past three years made any changes in policy regarding the criteria for admission to teacher education?---------- Yes___ No___

If YES,

(1) please state the gist of such changes.

(2) please tell what effect you think such policy changes will have on the quality of your teacher education program and the number of candidates admitted.

If NO, please list any policy changes in teacher admissions your institution may be planning to put into effect.

X. What was the number of students admitted to your teacher education programs during the academic year 1980-1981?---------- _____

XI. What was the number of students who were given final denial during 1980-1981?---------- _____

XII. Please comment briefly on the trend in the number of admissions to your program over the past five years.

XIII. Does your institution have an active program of recruitment for candidates to teacher education? Yes___ No___

If YES,

(1) please state what special types of students you are actively recruiting.

(2) please tell how successful you think your recruitment has been.

(3) How many years has this recruitment program been in effect?---------- _____

XIV. It is possible that this survey has not addressed all the problems/concerns regarding admissions to teacher education that pertain to your institution. If so, will you please state such problems/concerns. (You may continue on the back of this page.)

XV. Do you want a copy of the findings of this study? Yes___ No___

Your Name and Address:

_____

_____

_____

_____
City State Zip

Please return completed questionnaire to:

Dr. Archie E. Laman
Dept. of Teacher Education
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

APPENDIX C

STANDARDIZED TESTS OF SPECIFIC BASIC SKILLS REPORTED TO BE USED AS A CRITERION FOR ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION

Tests	No. of Institutions
ACT	7
CAT	5
CAT--Math only	1
CTBS--Math only	1
College English Placement Test	1
Cooperative Arithmetic Test	1
Iowa Silent Reading Test	1
Nelson-Denny Reading Test	3
McGraw-Hill Reading Test	1
McGraw-Hill Writing Test	1
MATS	1
MMPI	1
SAT	5
SCAT	2
SRA (Reading, Grammar, Math)	1
Standardized Diagnostic Reading Test	1
WRAT--Math and Reading	1
National Teachers Examination	1
Total	35

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES ON ADDITIONAL CRITERIA USED FOR ADMISSION, NOT SPECIFIED IN OTHER TABLES

Criteria		No. of Institutions
Communication requirements:		
Department test of English writing and English usage	2	
English course	3	
GPA of 2.0 in English	1	
Math course--C level	1	
Oral communications test	2	
Oral and written communications test	1	
Speech course	1	
Speech course--C level	1	
Two English courses--C level	1	
Writing sample	2	
		15
Field experiences		2
Health test		2
Hearing test		3
Laboratory practicum		1
Mainstreaming examination		1
Major area tests		1
Mathematics competency test		7
Personality inventory		1
Reading test		1
School interview with principal and teachers		1
Specific diagnostic tests		2
Varies according to special field		1
Total		38